

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
AT BECKLEY**

MILIK TURNER,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:22-cv-00175

KATINA HECKARD,

Respondent.

ORDER

Pending are Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [ECF 1], filed on April 11, 2022, and Respondent's Motion to Dismiss Petition [ECF 9], filed on August 2, 2023. This action was previously referred to the Honorable Dwane L. Tinsley, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation ("PF&R"). Magistrate Judge Tinsley his PF&R on October 13, 2023. Magistrate Judge Tinsley recommended that the Court find Petitioner's § 2241 Petition is now moot due to his release from BOP custody, grant Respondent's Motion to Dismiss Petition, deny as moot Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, and dismiss this matter from the Court's docket.

The Court need not review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) ("A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations *to which objection is made.*" (emphasis added)). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner's right to appeal the Court's order. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also* *United States v. De Leon-*

Ramirez, 925 F.3d 177, 181 (4th Cir. 2019) (Parties may not typically “appeal a magistrate judge’s findings that were not objected to below, as § 636(b) doesn’t require de novo review absent objection.”); *Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989). Further, the Court need not conduct de novo review when a party “makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Objections in this case were due on October 30, 2023. No objections were filed.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the PF&R [**ECF 10**], **GRANTS** Respondent’s Motion to Dismiss Petition [**ECF 9**], **DENIES** as moot Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [**ECF 1**], and **DISMISSES** the matter.

The Court directs the Clerk to transmit a copy of this Order to any counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: November 13, 2023



Frank W. Volk
Frank W. Volk
United States District Judge